

### REMARKS

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 16, and 21-23 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in, but is not limited to, Figures 1-4 and pages 4-14 of the specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejections

Claims 2-5 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph. In particular, features of claims 2 and 9 were identified as not complying with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph. Herein claims 2 and 9 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 and 9-12 comply with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) Rejections

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,757,897 (hereafter Shi). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Focusing on Independent Claim 21, it is respectfully submitted that Shi fails to disclose all the features of Independent Claim 21. In particular, Independent Claim 21 is directed to a method and recites in part, "wherein each task has a different priority value; before starting any of said tasks, selecting and starting execution of a first task of said tasks, wherein said first task has highest priority value and is not dependent on completion of any other of said tasks." (Emphasis added). In contrast, Shi discloses numerous priority values and discloses several tasks assigned the same priority value. (See Figures 1-4 of Shi). Moreover, Shi discloses that the highest priority task is executed at any time instead of being the first task to be executed, as in Independent Claim 21. (See col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 12, of Shi)

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 21 is not anticipated by Shi and is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, Independent Claim 22 has features similar to the features of Independent Claim 21. Therefore, Independent Claim 22 is not anticipated by Shi for the reasons discussed with respect to Independent Claim 21.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2-5 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,757,897 (hereafter Shi). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 2-5 and 9-12 are dependent on one of allowable Independent Claims 21 and 22, which are patentable over Shi. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-5 and 9-12 are patentable over Shi and are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 6-7, 13-14, 16-20, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,757,897 (hereafter Shi), in view of Abgrall, U.S. Patent No. 6,401,202 (hereafter Abgrall). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 6-7 and 13-14 are allowable over Shi because they are dependent on one of Independent Claims 21 and 22, which are allowable over Shi. Moreover, Abgrall fails to disclose features of Independent Claims 21 and 22 not shown by Shi. Therefore, Independent Claims 21 and 22 are patentable over the combination of Shi and Abgrall and are in condition for allowance. Since Dependent Claims 6-7 and 13-14 depend from one of Independent Claims 21 and 22, Dependent Claims 6-7 and 13-14 are patentable over the combination of Shi and Abgrall and are in condition for allowance.

Further, Independent Claim 23 has features similar to the features of Independent Claim 21. Therefore, Independent Claim 23 is patentable over Shi for the reasons discussed with respect to Independent Claim 21. Dependent Claims 16-20 are allowable over Shi because they are dependent on

Independent Claim 23, which is allowable over Shi. Moreover, Abgrall fails to disclose features of Independent Claim 23 not shown by Shi. Therefore, Independent Claim 23 is patentable over the combination of Shi and Abgrall and is in condition for allowance. Since Dependent Claims 16-20 depend from Independent Claim 23, Dependent Claims 16-20 are patentable over the combination of Shi and Abgrall and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES, LLP

Dated: 5/11/2009

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia  
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9080 ext. 128 Direct Line  
(408) 938-9060 General Line